

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

FELICIA JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:22-cv-02831-MSN-cgc

YAZAKI NORTH AMERICA, INC.,

Defendant.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND GRANTING DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Before the Court is the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, (“Report”) entered on August 26, 2024. (ECF No. 30) The Report recommends that Defendant Yazaki North America, Inc.’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 23) be granted and that Plaintiff Felicia Jackson’s purported Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 24) be administratively closed¹ for failure to comply with Local Rules 7.2 and 56.1. The parties had fourteen (14) days to submit objections to the Report. (*Id.* at PageID 231.) To date, neither party has submitted any objections.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Congress enacted 28 U.S.C. § 636 to relieve the burden on the federal judiciary by permitting the assignment of district court duties to magistrate judges. *See United States v. Curtis*, 237 F.3d 598, 602 (6th Cir. 2001) (citing *Gomez v. United States*, 490 U.S. 858, 869–70 (1989));

¹ The Magistrate Judge recommended that Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 24) be “administratively closed.” While the Court adopts this recommendation in substance because administrative closure is not a recognized procedural action for motions under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court instead **DENIES** the motion due to failure to comply with Local Rules 7.2 and 56.1.

see also Baker v. Peterson, 67 F. App'x 308, 310 (6th Cir. 2003). For dispositive matters, “[t]he district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.” *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1). After reviewing the evidence, the court is free to accept, reject, or modify the magistrate judge’s proposed findings or recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The district court is not required to review—under a *de novo* or any other standard—those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge’s findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *See id.* at 151.

Objections to any part of a magistrate judge’s disposition “must be clear enough to enable the district court to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious.” *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995); *see also Arn*, 474 U.S. at 147 (stating that the purpose of the rule is to “focus attention on those issues . . . that are at the heart of the parties’ dispute.”). Each objection to the magistrate judge’s recommendation should include how the analysis is wrong, why it was wrong, and how *de novo* review will obtain a different result on that particular issue. *See Howard v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). A general objection, or one that merely restates the arguments previously presented and addressed by the magistrate judge, does not sufficiently identify alleged errors in the report and recommendation. *Id.* When an objection reiterates the arguments presented to the magistrate judge, the report and recommendation should be reviewed for clear error. *Verdone v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 16-CV-14178, 2018 WL 1516918, at *2 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 28, 2018) (citing *Ramirez v. United States*, 898 F. Supp. 2d 659, 663 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)); *Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. Dolgencorp, LLC*, 277 F. Supp. 3d 932, 965 (E.D. Tenn. 2017).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The Magistrate Judge issued her Report on August 26, 2024. (ECF No. 30.) The parties had until September 9, 2024, to submit any objections to the Report's findings. To date, no objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the Report for clear error and finds none. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation in its entirety. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 23) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 24) is not properly filed and is therefore administratively **DENIED** for failure to comply with the Local Rules. The Complaint (ECF No. 1) and all claims in this matter are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 9th day of October, 2024.

s/ Mark S. Norris

MARK S. NORRIS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE